

## ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION II

No. CA10-611

FRANCIS MORGAN

APPELLANT

V.

METHODIST FAMILY HEALTH

APPELLEE

**Opinion Delivered** FEBRUARY 9, 2011

APPEAL FROM THE ARKANSAS  
WORKERS' COMPENSATION  
COMMISSION  
[NO. F811602]

AFFIRMED

---

**ROBERT J. GLADWIN, Judge**

Appellant Francis Morgan appeals from a decision of the Arkansas Workers' Compensation Commission denying and dismissing her claim for benefits following an alleged injury to her shoulder incurred as a result of restraining a child during her employment as a teacher with appellee Methodist Family Health. Specifically, appellant argues that the Commission's opinion was not supported by substantial evidence. We affirm by memorandum opinion. *See In re Memorandum Opinions*, 16 Ark. App. 301, 700 S.W.2d 63 (1985).

Memorandum opinions may be issued in any or all of the following cases:

- (a) Where the only substantial question involved is the sufficiency of the evidence;
- (b) Where the opinion, or findings of fact and conclusions of law, of the trial court or agency adequately explain the decision and we affirm;
- (c) Where the trial court or agency does not abuse its discretion and that is the only substantial issue involved; and

Cite as 2011 Ark. App. 97

(d) Where the disposition of the appeal is clearly controlled by a prior holding of this court or the Arkansas Supreme Court and we do not find that our holding should be changed or that the case should be certified to the supreme court.

*Id.* at 302, 700 S.W.2d at 63. This case falls squarely within category (b). The Commission adopted the decision of the administrative law judge (ALJ), who authored a well-reasoned opinion, and the record contains a substantial quantum of evidence to support the denial of benefits. The ALJ and the Commission ultimately decided that appellant's account of events was not credible, and they were not persuaded that appellant had injured her shoulder at work by reaching to restrain a child on the alleged date of injury. It is the Commission's duty, not ours, to make credibility determinations, to weigh the evidence, and to resolve conflicts in the medical testimony and evidence. *Martin Charcoal, Inc. v. Britt*, 102 Ark. App. 252, 284 S.W.3d 91 (2008).

We therefore affirm by memorandum opinion pursuant to section (b) of our per curiam, *In re Memorandum Opinions, supra*.

Affirmed.

HOOFFMAN and BROWN, JJ., agree.